



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

people's claims, Feisul has been dealing with the representatives of France, and his latest utterances indicate some modification of his insistence. What these claims originally were may be inferred from the appeal which he sent to President Wilson and the Government of the United States. It said:

"The Arab district, namely, Syria, including Palestine, Hedjaz, and Mesopotamia, which has suffered for centuries under Turkish misrule, unable to get justice, has revolted against the Caliph's call and rendered the call of Islam for a holy war void in the Mohammedan world.

"This was done by the Arabs for a realization of the aspirations and rights which the Allies, especially Great Britain, acknowledged and promised to secure for us. The principles laid down by you were gladly accepted by the Allies, who admitted that the war was one of liberation and not of conquest. The liberated nations, especially Syria, were assured that they would be given the right to choose the power they desired to assist them in government.

"The Arabs rushed into the World War upon these principles, in full confidence of the clear promises of the Allies that the Arabs would be given liberty. After the armistice, a secret treaty, unknown to the Arabs, divided Syria into four zones, under different administrations, which made the population furious. But public excitement was quieted by assurances that these divisions were temporary, and that they would vanish with the military government.

"Because of the great danger of having all Syria inflamed into insurrection, it was necessary to call a constituent assembly, elected by the nation, which proclaimed the country's independence and elected me chief, thus assuring peace to the country, which conforms to the promises and declarations of the Allies.

"We want only our rights, conferred by nature and by our great sacrifices in the war. We entertain the hope that the Allies will receive our new regulations with pleasure and endeavor to remove the obstacles which might hinder our progress. We desire nothing except to live peacefully in a peaceful world. Owing to the present situation, I hope you will assist us in defending our case and render a decision in conformity with your principles.

"We intend to safeguard the interests of the Allies in our country and protect the rights of all foreigners. The definitely arranged division of Syria into various parts is detrimental to our national life. It is impossible, for both political and economic reasons, to have peace without liberty and unity."

INCREASING THE SPEED

THE BIG BERTHAS bombarded Paris from a distance of approximately seventy-five miles. A French lieutenant, Delamare-Maze, has invented a contrivance by which it will be possible to double the range of guns of the pattern of the Big Berthas. It is reported that the velocity of the shell will be increased from 2,625 feet to 4,625 feet a second and the range lengthened to 150 miles. This is evidently a serious matter, for the French Government has purchased the patent. There-

fore this instrument of destruction is a thing to be reckoned with.

So the merry game goes on. Shortly there will be practically no limit to the destruction possible to life and property which an enemy will be able to inflict. As the *London Times* complains in its number for April 2:

"London, for instance, could be bombarded by batteries of new guns stationed at Zeebrugge or mounted on ships cruising far from land in the North Sea; and at the same time be bombed by a fleet of thousands of airplanes carrying far heavier supplies of far more destructive explosives than anything yet seen. The prospects, especially for big towns, which would certainly be the first objectives to be attacked, is appalling. Whole areas would be wiped out, with their human populations, and it is conceivable that an unscrupulous power, making an unjustified attack, might so take its intended victim by surprise as to end the war almost before it began. . . . War is destined to become a much more serious menace than it has been to the prosperity and happiness of the world."

Yes, that is the plain fact.

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING DEFEATED

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES on February 25 so reacted to the report of its Committee on Military Affairs, favoring compulsory military training of the youth of the land, that it was decided to eliminate the section from the army bill, for which the House later stood sponsor.

In the Senate friends of compulsory training also controlled the Committee on Military Affairs, and hence the Senate's army bill included provisions making the compulsory system operative in 1921, at a cost which, at the lowest, meant not less than \$700,000,000 a year.

Debate of this bill and its section for continuing in times of peace the system used in "the selective service" of the "World War" opened early in April, Senator Wadsworth, of New York, championing the measure, and Senator McKellar, of Tennessee, attacking it. Two days' debate indicated so clearly that the plan for setting up conscription in the United States could not pass through the Senate as at present constituted and with world conditions as they now are, that it was agreed to drop the section fixing the system on the nation. The proposed increase of the military forces, it was decided, is to be left to the voluntary action of individuals, for whom special provisions are to be made in the way of military training and general and vocational education at specified times and regular seasons.

It was in vain that champions of the compulsory system cited, with more or less justification, the claim that the President and the Secretary of War favored the

compulsory plan. Opponents, with equal facility of quotation, showed that the President also had called upon his party followers in Congress to postpone definite decision on so important a matter until the world condition altered and it was clear just what the military policy of the country should be.

The decisive defeat of the party of "compulsion" is due, in our opinion, to three facts:

First. Much of the evidence accumulated by Congress relative to the conduct of the war, the treatment suffered by privates and subordinate officers, and the caste spirit of the "regular" officers has made it impossible to get some of the lawmakers to support any plan which forces youth into a life that is prophetic during days of peace of such experiences in time of war.

Second. A very large proportion of the men who formed the A. E. F. and a much larger proportion of their kinsfolk, who have had a chance to study the war's effect upon the youths who went forth, are, as voters, dead set against America taking up with a policy that has cursed Europe and that England already has indicated she dare not continue. These voters, old and new, who are to shape largely the outcome of the coming elections, have let lawmakers know what they want and what they do not want; and the lawmakers have obeyed their intimations.

Third. The wisest of the party leaders and the most statesmanlike of the legislators, facing a deficit of from \$3,000,000,000 to \$5,000,000,000 in the national accounts for the present fiscal year and knowing that the people are muttering and preparing to punish parties or persons who add anything to the taxes dared not propose adding an item of expenditure that, at a minimum estimate, meant an increase of \$700,000,000 a year. To do so meant personal, political suicide, and also would handicap their party in the coming election. Arguments as to the necessity of "preparedness" against foes abroad—named or suspected—had no effect on this group of opportunists.

That other motives influenced some of the Senators we doubt not. We have confined our comment to three that we know had weight. But it would be unfair to seem to intimate that all the votes were prudential and based on policy or on knowledge recently acquired and specially applicable to these times. Some Senators voted because of deep-rooted moral conviction that once the militarist camel got his nose under the flap of the tent he would never be dislodged. They had had all their beliefs respecting the unfortunate effects of enforced life in barracks and under the discipline of absolutists confirmed by the testimony of the youths who made the best records in the "selective service." They

did not and they do not believe that the army is the best school for American youth, however illiterate, physically defective, or without institutional civic morale they may be. These Senators voted for a voluntary system with a clear conscience, as the lesser of two evils. But neither the Germany of yesterday nor the France of today is their model State for America to copy.

THE publication by Mr. Roosevelt's literary executor in *Scribner's Magazine* of much of the correspondence between the former President and the sovereigns of Europe is enabling his countrymen to see how much he did in the way of shaping the national foreign policy without taking the public into his confidence. Thus, in connection with the Algeciras conference, it is claimed by Mr. Roosevelt that at the solicitation of the then Kaiser he promoted the calling of the conference; that he, Roosevelt, drew up the terms of settlement which were adopted, and that he "fairly compelled the Kaiser to give his unwilling consent to them." Here is a clue that we would like to see followed up by some investigator. It shows the United States, by executive action exclusively, sharing in shaping European and African policy.

GOOD sense respecting study of German in the schools was shown by the House of Representatives, March 29, when considering the District of Columbia appropriation bill. As reported from the committee, none of the money set apart for the Washington schools was to be paid to any teacher imparting instruction in the German language. But "the war is over, and the sooner we admit it the greater self-respect we will have in future years," said Congressman Mann, who led a successful fight to have this provision stricken out of the bill.

IN THE March number of the *ADVOCATE* we called attention to the action of the Senate of the University of Berlin in punishing Prof. G. F. Nicolai, author of "The Biology of War," because of his candor during the war in pointing out the baneful effects of militarism upon German national life, resulting in her present defeat and disaster. We noted that he seemed inclined to come hitherward to find academic freedom. It is a pleasure to be able to chronicle that the Prussian Minister of Education at once rebuked the Berlin University Senate; insisted that Professor Nicolai should be conceded all his rights; and informed the Senate that the Department fully intended to protect academic freedom in the universities.

MEXICO's government has sent a commission to the United States to study the working of the Boy Scout movement, intending to use the material gathered in drafting a law that will make the Boy Scouts of Mexico subservient to the Department of War and a distinct part of the military arm of the republic. Is this the logic of the premises on which the argument for the Boy Scout movement is based?

ECUADOR and Colombia recently came to an agreement on a boundary dispute. On April 4 the fact was made the occasion of a fête day in both countries. Moreover, the presidents of the two countries proceeded to the frontier, and while national hymns were played by bands and while military contingents of the two countries saluted each the other, the cornerstone of a monument commemorating the event was laid. They do things admirably in Latin America, with due regard for symbolism and civic ritualism and their subtle effect on national psychology.

THE only woman seeking for nomination and election to the United States Senate, Miss Anne Martin, of Nevada, is opposed to the Treaty of Versailles; is in favor of a league of peace of all nations; would restore the pre-war rights of free speech, press, and assembly; would release all political prisoners and conscientious objectors, and would tax war-made millionaires to pay the costs of the war. Ozonic clarity this, anyhow.

EASTER DAY in Jerusalem saw a fight, with 188 casualties, mostly minor; but all symbolical of that "state of peace" which exists not only in the Sacred City of Jew, Christian, Moslem, and modern Zionist, but in the world at large as well.

M. ANDRÉ TARDIEU, French High Commissioner in the United States during the war and one of the Peace Commissioners at the Quai D'Orsay, renders a service by calling upon the French people to oppose the anti-American campaign in France. It is, as he says, both "dangerous and absurd." We of America, on the other hand, can never forget what France was to us over a century ago, or her unforgettable heroism along the Marne, the Yser, at Verdun. How can any American forget that along those terrible stretches countless French boys bared their breasts to German bullets until America could arrive? Mr. Wilson should speak no unkind word of France. We agree with M. Tardieu that, "having had the privilege of presiding

over these efforts on both sides of the ocean, I have the right to say that the service mutually rendered and received witnesses the great ability for collaboration of the two nations." Let the federation of the Boy Scouts of America with the Boy Scouts of France go on. Let the interchange between schools take place. As this French official adds, "If the two republics fail to draw from war and peace the mutual benefits they should, they will be unworthy of their past and unworthy of their future."

THE HISTORIAN of the "World War" in all its phases may have to come to the United States for material; for, with characteristic enterprise and lavish expenditure of funds, some of our universities and some of our private citizens have seen to it that data of all sorts should be gathered abroad and at home, suitably housed, and put in shape for quick and informing use by investigators. Princeton University, for instance, is said to have a collection that already numbers 1,000,000 titles if articles in periodicals are included. For this she owes a debt of gratitude to two alumni, one of them a governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Harvard and Yale are in the same class of collectors and are planning to collaborate with Princeton, so as to avoid undue duplication. Princeton is specializing in international law and economics.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY of the delegates of the peace societies will be held in Europe under the auspices of the Bureau International de la Paix, Berne, May 22. This meeting should be of interest, especially in the light of the opposition from certain quarters to the resolution adopted September last by the Council, fixing the responsibility of the war upon Germany; also in the light of the fact that there is a growing opinion that a constructive program for the union of the peace workers should not suffer again its fate of 1914.

TESTIMONY from British, Canadian, and American social welfare workers and from officials who have to administer relief funds and deal with the consequences of marital differences is virtually unanimous that a comparatively small number of the war-time marriages are proving to be happy or permanent unions. The disillusionment that comes with peace, its duties, its grim realities, its recurrence to such old-fashioned affairs as maternity, family support, and adjustment of temperaments and tempers, is proving hard for thousands of women and men who allowed the romantic aspects of war to set aside the safeguards of reason. This difficulty of substituting for the allurements of

khaki the reality of homespun is not confined to privates' and subordinate officers' war brides. It reaches up into the ranks of the higher officers and the women war workers in high administrative positions. Nor, since we are alluding to this matter of marriage, can it be forgotten how many cases are now being chronicled, in the courts and in the press, of wives who are seeking separation or divorce from husbands who had only to land in home camps or foreign ports to prove unfaithful to their vows of constancy.

SECRETARY ALEXANDER, of the Department of Commerce, protesting against a proposed plan for merging with the Department of State many of the bureaus for foreign trade now under his jurisdiction, and also making known his inability to favor, as a matter of theory, closer relations of the diplomatic and consular arms of the State Department, goes on record unequivocally. "In my opinion," he says, "it is a grave mistake to join too closely diplomacy and commerce. It is both a bad thing for diplomacy and a bad thing for commerce." His basic reason for this opposition is that diplomacy, when made the secret servant of trade, degenerates; and, on the other hand, successful trade cannot wait on "the necessary dignity, secrecy, and careful circumspection of diplomacy." This criticism cuts both ways, but its origin makes it worth noting.

FAREWELL ADDRESS

By GEORGE WASHINGTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, SEPTEMBER 17, 1796¹

OBSERVE good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct. And can it be that good policy does not enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and at no distant period a great nation to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt that in the course of time and things the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it? Can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded, and that in place of them just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated.

The nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur.

Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation prompted by ill will and resentment sometimes impels to war the government contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject. At other times it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty, of nations has been the victim.

So, likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter without adequate inducement or justification. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation) facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country without odium, sometimes even with popularity, gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils! Such an attachment of a small or weak toward a great and powerful nation dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter. Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp

¹ Richardson, James D.: "A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents," 1789-1897, vol. 1, pp. 221-223. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1896-1899.